DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 370 UD 020 068

AUTHOR Mohapatra, Manindra Kumar
TITLE Ethnicity and Political Orientations of "Affluent Ethnics": A Study of the Overseas Indians in the United States.
INSTITUTION Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk, Va. Dept. of Political Science.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 54p.: Research report prepared for the European Conference on Modern South Asian Studies (5th, Paris, France, July 9-13, 1978): Appendices may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans: Caste: Demography: Education Work Relationship: *Equal Opportunities (Jobs): Ethnic Groups: *Immigrants: *Indians: Minority Groups: *Racial Discrimination: *Social Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS India

ABSTRACT

This survey of overseas Indians in the United States concentrates on the "affluent ethnics" within this group. These individuals are described as generally engaged in professional vocations, living in middle-class neighborhoods, and caught in the dilemma between ethnicity and affluence. Many respondents report having experienced employment discrimination: such discrimination is generally correlated with educational background. Despite the persistence of this discrimination, only a minority of those surveyed support a protected class status for overseas Indians. It is also reported that overseas Indians retain a lively interest in Indian affairs, with particular concern for issues such as population control and the eradication of poverty. Included are tables, bibliographic references, and appendices. (WP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Political Science Department

Old Dominion University

ED182370

ETHNICITY AND POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS OF "AFFLUENT ETHNICS": A STUDY OF THE OVERSEAS INDIANS IN THE UNITED STATES*

by

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Manindra Kumar Mohapatra
Political Science Department
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23508
USA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Manindra Mohapatra
Old Dominion Univ.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Research Report Prepared for the Fifth European Conference on Modern South Asian Studies, July 9-13, 1978, Centre International d'Etudes Pedagogiques, Sevres, Paris France.

*Research reported in this paper was supported by the Department of Political Science and the Research Committee of the School of Arts and Letters, Old Dominion University. Mahesh Shah provided assistance in the mail survey for this project. Jack Andrews and Meenal Arunachalam provided assistance in computer analysis. Dr. Richard A. Skinner, Director, Computer-Based Laboratory for Instruction and Analysis provided data-processing facilities. The author is also thankful to the participants of his seminar on "Politics of Race" offered in Spring 1978 for their comments on certain earlier versions of this paper.

UDO 20068

I

ETHNICITY AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

Researchers in the field of Political Behavior have always been concerned with "race" and "ethnicity" as an independent variable in analyzing the political attitudes and behavior of the mass public.[1] However, in recent years the study of the political sub-culture of specific ethnic groups has gained some saliency in the literature.[2] In the American literature, considerable attention has been given to the study of black political sub-culture.[3] In recent years, the other American ethnic groups have been studied by the social scientists.[4] As a consequence of such studies, we have a lot more information about the political orientations of American ethnic groups. Similar scholarly research about ethnic groups in the other political systems have also emerged.[5] Thus we now have a body of literature dealing with the political orientations of ethnics as voters, lobbyists, legislators, administrators, judges and such other actors in the political systems.[6] The purpose of this limited study of "Affluent Ethnics" among Overseas Indians in the United States is a small attempt to expand this frontier of knowledge about ethnicity and political behavior.

The Overseas Indians, in general, have attracted considerable scholarly attention.[7] A review of such works indicate the great diversity in conceptualizations and methodologies. The Overseas Indians in the United States have been mostly studied by the Historians, Sociologists and Anthropologists.[8] Political Scientists have not paid much attention about the political behavior of Overseas Indians in the United States.

II

OVERSEAS INDIANS IN THE UNITED STATES: AN ILLUSIVE SEARCH FOR A STATISTICAL PROFILE

A basic question for a researcher in this context is an estimate of the Overseas Indian population in the United States. There is considerable statistical confusion about this. Professor Hugh Tinker, a leading authority on Overseas Indians, estimated that there where 32,062 Indians in the United States in the year 1969.[9] But a U.S. Government document indicates that the U.S. Census of 1970 found that there were 75,000 people of Indian origin in the United States.[10] The U.S. Immigration Statistics about Indians is limited to those people who formally migrated from India. It obviously does not include those Indians who came to the USA on the basis of quota assigned to other countries. Similarly, the American born Overseas Indian children find no place in the immigration statistics.

Now let us proceed to look at some specific statistical data about the Overseas Indians in the United States. As Table No. 1 shows, 127,704 Indians had migrated to the United States as of September 30, 1976. These figures are probably accurate with respect to those who have formally migrated to the United States on a quota assigned to India. But these figures are much smaller than the actual number of people of Indian origin who are in the United States. For instance, according to Table No. 1 40,784 Indians had migrated to U.S. till the year 1970 but the Census of 1970 found 75,000 people of Indian origin in the USA, which is nearly twice the number of Indian immigrants. Who are these others? They could be American born offOsprings, non-immigrants, visitors and other persons of Indian origin who have migrated on the basis of quota assigned to the other countries. In this connection Table No. 2 suggests a significant problem. In addition to those persons who have migrated to the United States as Indians, there are other immigrants who reported India as their country of birth. This difference between "Indians" and "India Born" is a significant number as shown in the Table No. 2.

Another interesting question in this context is about the Immigrants of Indian origin who were born elsewhere and who have migrated to the United States on the basis of quota assigned to these countries. Since they were also born outside India their size is not shown in these tabulations. All these problems suggest that at the present time we do not have accurate statistics about the number of "Overseas Indians" in the United States. Certain unofficial estimates suggest that there are about a quarter million people of Indian origin in the United States in 1978.[11] Although it is difficult to accept this figure, one can conclude that there are more Indians in the United States than suggested by the official census and immigration statistics. It is anticipated that the Census of 1980 would provide a more accurate estimate about the Indians in the United States.[12]

The Table No. 3 provides a limited set of information about the spatial distribution of the Overseas Indians in the United States. This data is based upon the alien address report program and covers about 82 thousand Overseas Indians (both immigrants and non-immigrants). For obvious reasons it excludes those who have acquired the U.S. citizenship, Indians who have migrated from other countries and the U.S. born children of Indian origin. Despite these limitations the data is indicative of certain patterns about the spatial distribution of Indians. The largest number of these Indians are located in the mid-Atlantic States. The mountain states have attracted smallest proportion of Indians. Nearly 60% of the Indians are probably located in the region between the District of Columbia and Maine. The Pacific Coast data is quite illusive which has much higher number of Indians than shown here. Most of the early immigrants from India settled on the pacific coast and most of them are citizens now.[13] As such they are excluded from the alien address reporting program.

Occupational background of the Overseas Indians is another factor that deserves some attention here. There are all kinds of statistics and informal estimates about the occupational background of Indians in the United States. An U.S. based Indian magazine estimates that every fifth

TABLE NO. 1

INDIAN IMMIGRANTS
IN THE USA
(1820-1976)

YEARS	NO. OF INDIAN IMMIGRANTS
1820 - 1950	11,595
1951 - 1960	2,000
1961 - 1970	27,189
1971	13,056
1972	15,589
1973	11,975
1974	11,694
1975	14,336
1976*	20,260
TOTAL	127,704

SOURCE: Immigration and Naturalization Service 1976 Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977) pp. 88-89.

*As of September 30, 1976

TABLE NO. 2

COMPARATIVE DATA ON INDIAN
IMMIGRANTS IN USA AND IMMIGRANTS
REPORTING INDIA AS THE COUNTRY OF THEIR BIRTH
(1951-1976)

YEAR	BORN INDIA	INDIAN IMMIGRANTS	DIFFERENCE
1951 - 1960	3,100	2,000	1,100
1961 - 1970	31,200	27,189	4,001
1971 - 1974	57,100	52,314	4,786
1975	15,800	14,336	1,464
1976	22,100	20,260	1,840
TOTAL	129,300	116,099	13,191

SOURCE: Immigration and Naturalization Service 1976 Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977)

*As of September 30, 1976

TABLE NO. 3

SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF NON-CITIZEN INDIAN IMMIGRANT AND NON-IMMIGRANT PERSONS REPORTING ADDRESS TO U.S. IMMIGRATION SERVICE IN 1976

REGION	DISTRIBUTION OF INDIANS
NORTH-EASTERN STATES Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut	4,164
MID-ATLANTIC STATES New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania	30,446
EASTERN NORTH CENTRAL STATES Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin	19,405
WESTERN NORTH CENTRAL STATES Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, No. Dakota, So. Dakato, Nebraska and Kansas	2,013
SOUTH ATLANTIC STATES Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, No. Carolina, So. Carolina Georgia, Florida and District of Columbia	8,908
SOUTH CENTRAL STATES Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi	1,514
SOUTH WESTERN STATES Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas	1,514

TABLE NO. 3 - Cont'd

REGION	DISTRIBUTION OF INDIANS
MOUNTAIN STATES Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah and Nevada	1,058
PACIFIC STATES Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska and Hawaii	10,168
ELSEWHERE U.S. Territories, etc.	239
TOTAL	82,369

SOURCE: Immigration and Naturalization Service 1976 Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977)

Indian in the USA is an Engineer.[14] The occupational background data obtained from the recent most report of immigration service provides a varied profile.[15] The data on early Indians suggests that most such Indians were manual workers.[16] Against such confustion of data it is almost impossible to project an occupational profile of the Overseas Indian people in the United States.

III

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The research reported in this paper is a limited study of "Affluent Ethnics" among the Overseas Indians in the United States. It does not propose to suggest any general conclusions about the diverse groups of Overseas Indians in the United States. "Affluent Ethnics" is suggested as a theoretical construct to represent the new immigrants from India. This is not to suggest that all new immigrants from India have acquired the characteristics of affluence in the United States.

The "Affluent Ethnics" are defined as "those recent immigrants from India who have acquired a middle class and higher middle class economic status in American Society." The following are some of the specific

characteristics of the "Affluent Ethnics" as defined in this study. It is important to keep in perspective that it is merely a theoretical construct.

1. An "Affluent Ethnic" is generally engaged in professional callings such as medicine, law, college teaching, management, scientific research and also as the proprietor of business concern.

2. An "Affluent Ethnic" is a property owner or rents property in middle class neighborhoods. More often this person is a suburnbanite.

3. An "Affluent Ethnic" is caught in the dilemma between "ethnicity" and "affluence." Based on cultural origin an "Affluent Ethnic" is legally classified as a minority. But his "affluence" brings him much closer to his non-ethnic peers, in terms of economic status.

For our purpose, we have operationalized and construct "Affluent Ethnics" as those Overseas Indians who are listed in the Who is Who Among Indians in North America (1975).[17]

The rationale for conceptualizing these Indians as "Affluent Ethnics" is that most of these people belong to a much higher economic and occupational status than the average American. In this sense they are affluent. We have chosen to call them ethnics for objective rather than subjective reasons. Some of them may not choose to be labelled as ethincs, but their objective classification is the basis of our teaching them as ethnics.

Having explained the nature of the theoretical construct "Affluent Ethnics' utilized here, let us specify the research objectives of the present study.

The present study specifically explores their political orientations. The specific questions analyzed in this context include the following: What is the socio-economic profile of these "Affluent Ethnics"? Do they perceive or experience any discrimination in American society? How do they evaluate their ethnic minority/protected class status under existing American laws? What is the nature of their public policy preference in relation to the American political system? How do they perceive the national policy priorities for the Indian political system?

Such data were obtained through a survey research and the following section explains methodological dimensions of this research.

IV

METHODOLOGY

All persons who are included in the Who is Who Among Indians in

North America (1975) (excluding residents in Canada) were operationalized as "Affluent Ethnics." In all 1129 persons fell in this category. Immediately following the Indian Lok Sabha elections of 1977, all these persons were mailed a 96 item questionnaire. An introductory letter describing the scholarly nature of this mail survey was included and a return envelop which was serially numbered at the back. Simultaneously four Indian ethnic newspapers were supplied with a brief press release about this survey. Two of these newspapers published this news item. The response to this survey was varied and certain interesting patterns emerged in the response sets.

At least 10 people who had received the questionnaire tried to establish telephone contact with the researcher. Only one of these respondents was critical about the whole idea behind the survey and was particularly upset about the collection of data on caste, religion, income, linguistic origin and such other allegedly sensitive data.

All other persons who had contacted the researcher were generally complimentary about such an effort. Some wanted to be helpful in the survey, some had methodological suggestions, some wanted other questions included in the survey. At least 5 persons returned the blank questionnaire suggesting their unwillingness to participate in the survey. One western spouse of an Indian included in the survey sent a rather lengthy letter for conducting this study. She was particularly upset about questions relating to discrimination experience in American society and indicated that her husband did not want to participate in the survey for this very reason.

The news item in the Indian press brought responses from individuals who were not included in this survey seeking information and in some cases volunteering participation in the survey. Publication of preliminary findings in the Indian newspapers brought in a number of requests from Indians, non-Indians, organizations and one attorney handling labor relations about copies of papers. At least 10 social scientists (including graduate students) requested copies of the research report.

By the end of April 1977, 185 completed questionnaires were received. A follow-up request was sent out in the first week of May 1977. This brought in more completed questionnaires, some with sincere apologies for the delay. It also brought at least 10 letters from individuals who had not received the questionnaire. Such individuals were supplied with a duplicate questionnaire. An interesting pattern in the response behavior was at least 25 individuals had erased the identifying number on the return envelop or had returned the questionnaire in another envelope which did not have any return address.

There were a few completed questionnaires in which the background information was left blank or the page on demographic data was taken out. Some items were left incomplete with notes suggesting a too lengthy questionnaire. Quite a few respondents wrote cryptic remarks like "stupid question," "do not ask this question in the 20th century," against caste and religion questions. Quite a few chose to leave these items blank.

In all 212 usable questionnaires were available for analysis by September 1977. One person sent in the questionnaire in December 1977. In all 213 respondents have been analyzed in this paper.

V

"AFFLUENT ETHNICS" AMONG OVERSEAS INDIANS: A PROFILE

The Table No. 4 provides a general profile of the survey respondents. The occupational distribution of the respondents indicates a slight over-representation of the academics in this group. This may be due to response bias in a mail survey of this nature. In any case, the professional composition of the group as a whole is clearly indicated by the occupation distribution of this group.

The family size data is indicative of the smallness of the families of the group as a whole nearly 90% of the group has less than three members in their families. This should be viewed in some contrast with traditional Indian families.

The age distribution indicates about one half of the respondents were between the ages 31 to 40 and the remaining were distributed among the other age group. The group as a whole is overwhelmingly male and is understandable in the light of sample frame. A surprising indicator in this data is about home ownership. Over 63% of the respondents were home owners. The income distribution is also equally impressive. About a half of the entire group had a total family income of over $25,000 per year in 1976.

The educational background before entering the United States indicates that 95% of these immigrants had held college degrees before leaving India. About a third of the group had earned an American doctorate.

Two interesting political indicators about this group is about their favorite American and Indian political parties. A great majority of the group (60%) view the Democratic party with favoring the proportion of support for the Republican is as low as 10%. As regards their favorite Indian party, Congress continues to have a higher level of support (27%) compared to Janata (19%).[18] It is surprising to note that as many as 44% indicated no favorite party. This is particularly surprising in the light of the data that only about 25% indicated no favorite American Party.

On the whole, the group as a whole projects a very different image than that of the population of India. This might raise interesting theoretical questions about what sort of people migrate? They probably significantly differ from the general population.[19]

TABLE NO. 4

THE SURVEY RESPONDENTS: A GENERAL PROFILE
(N = 212)

OCCUPATION	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
Academic	25.7%
Engineer	16.8%
Doctor/Dentist/Veterinarian	20.6%
Scientific Worker	8.9%
Businessman	6.1%
Teacher	4.7%
Manager/Executive	4.7%
Other Occupation	6.5%
Missing Data	6.1%
TOTAL	100.0%

FAMILY SIZE	
Single	7.9%
Two	9.3%
3-5	67.3%
Over 5	8.5%
Missing Data	7.0%

AGE DISTRIBUTION	
Under 25	0.5%
25-30	7.5%
31-35	19.2%
36-40	29.9%
41-45	17.3%
46-50	8.9%
51-60	7.5%
60+	2.3%
Missing Data	7.0%
TOTAL	100.0%

SEX	
Male	88.3%
Female	5.1%
Missing Data	6.6%
TOTAL	100.0%

CASTE ORIGIN	
Brahmin	20.8%
Non-Brahmir	54.7%
Non-Hindus and Caste Non-Identifiers	18.9%
Missing Data	5.7%

TABLE NO. 4 - Cont'd

HOME OWNERSHIP	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
Owner	63.6%
Renter	29.0%
Missing Data	7.5%
FAMILY ANNUAL INCOME IN 1976	
Under $10,000	1.9%
10-15	7.0%
15-20	12.1%
20-25	22.0%
25-30	14.5%
30-35	21.0%
50+	16.4%
Missing Data	5.1%
TOTAL	100.0%
HIGHEST EDUCATION BEFORE ENTERING UNITED STATES	
Some College	5.1%
Bachelor's Degree	39.7%
Master/Ph.D	25.2%
Professional Degree	22.9%
Missing Data	7.0%
TOTAL	100.0%
AMERICAN EDUCATION	
Some College	4.7%
Bachelor's Degree	4.2%
Master	32.7%
Ph.D.	28.0%
Non-Degree Training	6.5%
No American Education	11.7%
Missing Data	12.1%
FAVORITE INDIAN POLITICAL PARTY	
Congreee	27.6%
Janata	19.2%
Other Parties	8.9%
Missing Data	44.4%
FAVORITE AMERICAN POLITICAL PARTY	
Democrat	60.3%
Republican	10.7%
Other	3.7%
Missing Data	25.2%
TOTAL	100.0%

VI

THE AFFLUENT ETHNICS AND PUBLIC POLICY PRIORITIES IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

In this section, we shall analyze the public policy preferences of the "affluent ethnics."[20] Some specific questions that have been explored in this paper are as follows: Are these new immigrants cognizant about the issues and public policies in the United States? What sort of priorities do they accord to different questions associated with the American public policies? Do the policy orientations of these people significantly differ from the policy priorities of the general population in the United States? If so, then in which areas do their policy priorities differ? What are some possible explanations for such variance? This paper will explore answers to some of these questions.

The Table No. 5 provides the distribution of survey respondents' high priority policy areas. The survey was conducted during the month of April-May 1977. Although the American public have become cognizant about the realities of energy crisis in 1973 the winter of 1976-77 had indicated the severity of the problem. The rank order indicates that the Overseas Indians as a group have accorded highest priority to energy crisis.

It is also pertinent to note that during this period the question of immigration control had gained considerable saliency in this period. There was much discussion in the national news media about the problem of undocumented aliens. It was specifically suggested that the illegal immigrant had contributed to the growing problem of unemployment in the country. It appears that most Overseas Indians do not perceive the immigration control as a problem deserving a high priority.

The Table No. 6 provides a distribution of no response categories. The highest percentage of missing data (8%) involves the "detente." It is possible to explain this rather high percentage of missing data in this category. Some respondents may have had some difficulty with the terminology "Detente." This could have generated some missing responses. "Detente" has also been perceived as a dilemma among the mass public in the United States.

The smallness of the missing data in the categories of "unemployment" and "energy crisis" were indicative of the fact that most respondents had developed a clear cut policy priority in this area.

POLICY PRIORITIES: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

In this section of the paper we shall examine specific policy priorities in related groups. Such analysis would provide a way of comparing the relative priorities.

TABLE NO. 5

PUBLIC POLICY PRIORITIES OF OVERSEAS INDIANS: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE
(N = 213)

POLICY AREAS	PERCENTAGE RESPONDENTS INDICATING HIGH PRIORITY	PRIORITY RANKING
ENERGY CRISIS	84.5%	1
UNEMPLOYMENT	71.8%	2
INFLATION	71.4%	3
MASS TRANSIT	62.9%	4
EDUCATIONAL STANDARD	56.8%	5
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION	56.3%	6
LAW AND ORDER	54.9%	7
HEALTH CARE	53.5%	8
ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	45.1	9
POLITICAL CORRUPTION	39.9%	10
BLACK POVERTY	37.6	11
URBAN RENEWAL	31.5	12
HOUSING	27.2%	13
MILITARY CAPABILITY	23.9%	14
DETENTE WITH USER	22.1%	15
IMMIGRATION CONTROL	18.3%	16

TABLE NO. 6

PROPORTION OF MISSING
DATA IN SURVEY RESPONSES

POLICY AREAS	PERCENTAGE CF MISSING DATA N=213	RANK ORDER
DETENTE WITH USER	8.0%	1
URBAN RENEWAL	5.2%	2
IMMIGRATION CONTROL	5.2%	
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION	5.2%	
POLITICAL CORRUPTION	5.2%	
EDUCATIONAL STANDARD	4.7%	3
HOUSING	4.7%	
ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	4.7%	
HEALTH CARE	4.2%	4
BLACK POVERTY	4.2%	
MILITARY CAPABILITY	4.2%	
LAW AND ORDER	3.8%	5
INFLATION	3.3%	6
MASS TRANSIT	3.3%	
ENERGY CRISIS	2.3%	7
UNEMPLOYMENT	2.3%	

(A) RACE RELATIONS POLICY AND OVERSEAS INDIANS

The Overseas Indians have experienced discriminations in differing cultural settings from Guyana to Fiji.[21] A variety of explanations have been suggested to identify the factors associated with such discriminations toward the Indians. Given this background it appears that the Overseas Indians included in our study would suggest a high priority for a policy area involving the racial discrimination and would sympathize with with the black population of the United States for their poverty which has been primarily associated with discriminatory practices in the U.S.A.

The survey questionnaire asked to respondents to assign high, low or medium priority to two policy areas relevant to this question--"Racial Discrimination" and "Black Poverty." The response pattern presented in Table No. 7 appears to be somewhat intriguing. A great majority (56%) of the respondents do give a high priority to the policy area of "Race Relations." In contrast with this response pattern one, slightly over a third of the respondents give high priority (37%) to the problem of "Black Poverty."

TABLE NO. 7

PRIORITY FOR BLACK POVERTY AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITIES INDICATED BY RESPONDENTS N=213	
BLACK POVERTY	High Priority	37.6%
	Medium Priority	47.4%
	Low Priority	10.3%
	Missing Data	4.7%
	TOTAL	100.0%
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION	High Priority	56.3%
	Medium Priority	28.2%
	Low Priority	10.3%
	Missing Data	5.2%
	TOTAL	100.0%

This stands in some contrast with the findings of Nie and Associates who found the new ethnics to be more "Pro Black."[22] One plausible explanation for this somewhat low level concern for the black poverty may be the social background of their survey respondents. These Overseas Indians may not identify with the nature of social discrimination experienced by the blacks in this country. It seems pertinent here to make a brief reference to the relationship between the Blacks and the Indian in Africa and Latin America. Such relationships is certainly stressful.[23]

(B) IMMIGRATION POLICY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Moving on to two other areas of public policy, we may observe an interesting trend. Considering the economic situation at the time of this survey, as indicated in Table No. 8, unemployment was perceived as a major problem in the U.S. A great majority of the Overseas Indians (71%) did give high priority to the solution of this issue.

The question of immigration control has been an issue in the USA for quite sometime. Recently, the question of illegal immigration has been tied to the issue of unemployment in the country. The Overseas Indian, in general, do not seem to be highly supportive of immigration control. As newly arrived immigrants most of these people anticipate to sponsor their relatives for immigration. This could explain their low priority for immigration control.

TABLE NO. 8

PRIORITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION CONTROL

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITY INDICATED BY RESPONDENTS N-213	
UNEMPLOYMENT	High Priority	71.8%
	Medium Priority	22.1%
	Low Priority	3.8%
	Missing Data	6.3%
	TOTAL	100.0%
IMMIGRATION CONTROL	High Priority	18.3%
	Medium Priority	46.9%
	Low Priority	29.6%
	Missing Data	5.2%
	TOTAL	100.0%

(C) HEALTH, HOUSING AND EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS

The Table No. 9 tabulates the comparative priorities of the Overseas Indians about Health Care, Housing and Educational standards. The respondents seem most concerned about the educational standard. A surprising minority of only about 27% of the respondents assign high priority to housing. The Health Care priority seems to be much higher.

One explanation may be suggested to explain these trends. Relatively low priority for "housing" could be attributable to the fact that most of these respondents (63%) are already homeowners. Perhaps the housing priority is perceived in terms of public housing programs and as such not pertinent to their interests. Concern for educational standard may be related to their concern for children's education. The Indian School Systems emphasize the basics and the "frill courses" in the American School System may have caused some concern for these Indian parents.

TABLE NO. 9

PRIORITY FOR HEALTH, CARE EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS FOR HOUSING

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITIES INDICATED N=213	
HEALTH CARE	High Priority	53.5%
	Medium Priority	34.3%
	Low Priority	8.0%
	Missing Data	4.2%
	TOTAL	100.0%
HOUSING	High Priority	27.2%
	Medium Priority	49.8%
	Low Priority	18.3%
	Missing Data	4.7%
	TOTAL	100.0%
EDUCATIONAL STANDARD	High Priority	56.8%
	Medium Priority	32.9%
	Low Priority	5.6%
	Missing Data	4.7%
	TOTAL	100.0%

(D) POLLUTION, MASS TRANSIT AND URBAN RENEWAL

The Table No. 10 provides a tabulation of the three policy priorities that we have conceptualized as "Urban Relevant Priorities." It appears a large percentate of the respondents (62%) give high priority to mass transit. A much lower percentage (45%) give such priority to pollution. A much smaller proportion (31%) give high priority to urban renewal.

TABLE NO. 10

URBAN RELEVANT POLICY PRIORITIES

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITIES INDICATED BY RESPONDENTS N=213	
URBAN RENEWAL	High Priority	31.5%
	Medium Priority	41.8%
	Low Priority	21.6%
	Missing Data	5.2%
	TOTAL	100.0%
MASS TRANSIT	High Priority	62.9%
	Medium Priority	24.4%
	Low Priority	9.4%
	Missing Data	3.3%
	TOTAL	100.0%
ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	High Priority	45.1%
	Medium Priority	37.6%
	Low Priority	12.7%
	Missing Data	4.7%
	TOTAL	100.0%

(E) MILITARY PRIORITIES AND OVERSEAS INDIANS

The Table No. 11 provides a comparative analysis of the defense related priorities.

The policy of the Government of India has always rejected the world power. Most Indian political parties, within a varying degree, have subscribed to this view. The educational

TABLE NO. 11

DEFENSE RELATED PRIORITIES OF OVERSEAS INDIANS

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITY INDICATED BY RESPONDENTS N-213	
DETENTE WITH SOVIET UNION	High Priority	22.1%
	Medium Priority	43.2%
	Low Priority	26.8%
	Missing Data	8.0%
	TOTAL	100.0%
MILITARY CAPABILITY	High Priority	23.9%
	Medium Priority	40.8%
	Low Priority	31.0%
	Missing Data	4.2%
	TOTAL	100.0%

system in Indian has also emphasized upon this view. The Overseas Indians do not seem to assign very high priority either to the policy of "Detente" and to "Military Capability" of the United States.

(F) LAW AND ORDER, POLITICAL CORRUPTION

The Table No. 12 provides a distribution of the perceived priorities of the Overseas Indians in relation to "Law and Order" and "Political Corruption." The survey was conducted in the post-Watergate period of American politics. Public opinion polls and academic studies had identified the concerns among the American public toward corruption in National politics and the rising crime rate. The data suggest that the Overseas Indians seem more concerned about "Law and Order" than "Political Corruption." Is it an indicator of political conservatism among the Overseas Indians?

The findings show these new immigrants from India seem cognizant and concerned about American public policies. Nearly 70% of the survey respondent indicated partisan support. Only a very small percentage expressed no opinion

TABLE NO. 12

PRIORITIES FOR LAW AND ORDER
AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITY INDICATED BY RESPONDENTS N-213	
LAW AND ORDER	High Priority	57.1%
	Medium Priority	26.8%
	Low Priority	14.6%
	Missing Data	3.8%
	TOTAL	100.0%
POLITICAL CORRUPTION	High Priority	39.9%
	Medium Priority	31.0%
	Low Priority	23.9%
	Missing Data	5.2%
	TOTAL	100.0%

on questions of public policy indicating that an overwhelming majority of these Indians do have an opinion about most areas of American public policies.

The policy priority of this new ethnic group showed some similarities and differences in relation to the American public. Such variances are probably attributable to their social standing in the community, their immigrant status and their political socialization in the Indian system.

There are many unanswered questions about the policy priorities of the Overseas Indians. What sort of Overseas Indians seem to indicate conservative policy orientations? Why are most Indians not so pro-black? Why are these Indians not so concerned about political corruption? Such questions merely suggest an agenda for future exploration.

In this context, it seems pertinent to examine the issue of discrimination involving the Overseas Indians in the USA.

VII

ATTITUDES TOWARD DISCRIMINATION
IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

What sort of discriminations are experienced by the Overseas Indians

in the United States? Is there such a thing as Anti-Indian feeling among the people in the United States? In the absence of mass-level attitudinal data, it is difficult to answer these questions. In the case of the present study, an attempt was made by asking survey questions to our respondents.[24]

Discrimination is a rather sensitive question. In particular, the first generation immigrant minority is likely to be concerned about a survey of this nature. There may be fears about the disclosure of their identity in survey results. A Chicago based study in this area ran into response problems while interviewing South Asian immigrants.[25]

The Table No. 13 tabulates the responses of the Overseas Indians with regard to their experiences in the United States. It seems within a varying degree some Indians indicated having expected discrimination in the United States. The highest percentage is indicated in the administrative job category. The second highest is the technical job category. These two response patterns suggest that in general that most Indians are probably discriminated in the job market. The level of discrimination is clearly higher in the case of administrative jobs as compared to the technical jobs.

TABLE NO. 13

TYPES OF DISCRIMINATIONS REPORTEDLY EXPERIENCED BY THE OVERSEAS INDIANS IN THE UNITED STATES
(N = 212)

TYPES OF DISCRIMINATION	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
RENTAL HOUSING	
Yes	16.8%
No	70.1%
Not Sure	7.5%
Missing Data	5.6%
BUYING HOME	
Yes	5.1%
No	75.7%
Not Sure	7.9%
Missing Data	11.2%
JOINING SOCIAL GROUPS	
Yes	8.9%
No	53.3%
Not Sure	24.8%
Missing Data	13.1%

TABLE NO. 13 - Cont'd

TYPES OF DISCRIMINATION	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
GETTING TECHNICAL JOBS	
Yes	22.0%
No	47.7%
Not Sure	17.8%
Missing Data	12.6%
GETTING ADMINISTRATIVE JOBS	
Yes	36.0%
No	30.8%
Not Sure	20.1%
Missing Data	13.1%
START BUSINESS/PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE	
Yes	14.5%
No	48.1%
Not Sure	21.5%
Missing Data	15.9%
ADMISSION TO HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTE	
Yes	10.3%
No	68.2%
Not Sure	12.1%
Missing Data	9.3%
ORGANIZING RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES	
Yes	7.5%
No	51.9%
Not Sure	21.5%
Missing Data	19.2%
DISCRIMINATING IN OTHER SITUATIONS	
Yes	12.1%
No	9.8%
Not Sure	5.1%
Missing Data	72.9%

SOME CORRELATES OF JOB RELATED DISCRIMINATIONS

In this section we shall explore the relationships between job related discriminations experienced by the Overseas Indians and their background

attributes.

Firstly, Table No. 14 provides a cross-tabulation between the American educational background of the respondents and their job discrimination experience. Although only a small number of respondents had earned a bachelor's degree in the United States none of them report any job related discrimination in the technical job category and only 12% of them indicated such discrimination in the Administrative Category.

TABLE NO. 14
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMERICAN
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS
AND THEIR EXPERIENCE IN JOB DISCRIMINATION

TYPE OF JOB DISCRIMINATION	BACHELOR'S DEGREE N=10	MASTER'S N=9	Ph.D N=62	NON-DEGREE TRAINING N=12	NO AMERICAN EDUCATION N=20
TECHNICAL JOBS					
Discriminated	0%	25%	22%	16.7%	45%
Not Discriminated	66.7%	54%	54%	75%	40%
Not Sure	33.3%	19%	24%	8.3%	15%
ADMINISTRATIVE JOBS					
Discriminated	12.5%	49.2%	43.4%	25%	60%
Not Discriminated	37.5%	32.2%	26.4%	50%	40%
Not Sure	50%	18.6%	30.2%	25%	0%

The proportion of respondents with no job-related discrimination consistently goes higher with high level of education. In the category of non-degree training 75% reported no discrimination. This category has mostly doctors, dentists and veterinarians. Among the respondents with no American education the level of job-related discrimination experience seems to be the highest.

Another interesting trend is consistently higher level of discrimination in the administrative job category compared with the technical job category.

The Table No. 15 examines the relationship between the occupational background of the survey respondents and their job-related discrimination experience. In general, it appears that the great majority of Engineers (55%) reported no discrimination in getting technical jobs. Seventy percent

TABLE NO. 15

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND
OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR EXPERIENCE WITH JOB DISCRIMINATION

EXPERIENCE WITH DISCRIMINATION	ACADEMIC N=53	DOCTORS, ETC. N=43	ENGINEERS N=36	SCIENTIFIC WORKERS N=19	TEACHERS N=11	EXECUTIVES N=10	ALL RESPONDENTS N=212
TECHNICAL JOBS							
Experienced Discrimination	26.4%	18.6%	19.4%	26.3%	18.2%	0%	21.2%
Did Not Experience	35.8%	55.8%	55.6%	36.8%	36.4%	70%	48.1%
Not Sure	26.4%	16.3%	22.2%	21.1%	9.1%	0%	17.9%
ADMINISTRATIVE JOBS							
Experienced Discrimination	52.8%	30.2%	36.1%	36.8%	27.3%	40%	35.8%
Did Not Experience	18.9%	44.2%	13.9%	21.1%	0%	30%	30.7%
Not Sure	20.8%	16.3%	36.1%	26.3%	27.3%	10%	20.3%

of the executives and managers also reported no discrimination in getting technical jobs. However, over a quarter of the academics and scientific professionals reported experiencing discrimination in getting technical jobs. When one examines the comparable data in the administrative job category there is considerable increase in the percentage of respondents who reported experiencing discrimination in getting administrative jobs.

It is particularly important to note that a majority of the academic respondents (52%) reported discrimination in this category.[26] About a third (30%) of the Engineers and scientific workers also report similar experiences. Among the doctors category also there is considerable increase (from 18% to 30%). Even in the category of Executives/Managers the porportion of reported job discrimination rises from 0% to 40%.

CORRELATES OF DISCRIMINATION EXPERIENCED IN JOINING SOCIAL GROUPS

As the general distribution indicated in Table No. 13 only a small percentage of the Overseas Indians reported experiencing discrimination in joining non-Indian social groups. It seems to pursue this analysis at some greater length by examining the relationship of certain independent variables to this experience in joining social groups.

Table No. 16 provides an overview of the relevance of some of these variables. Looking at the variable of homeownership it appears that none of the renter respondents report any experience in joining non-Indian social as opposed to about 14.8% homeowners. The data on income provides somewhat similar picture. As the level of income rises one observes steady increase in the discrimination experience. Those in the 20-25 thousand income bracket report highest percentage of discrimination experience (15%) and even those who are in 50+ income bracket 12% report similar experience.

The American educational background shows some interesting relationship to the experience in discrimination. Those with no American education, only 4.5% report experiencing discrimination. And those having American bachelor's degree have none in this category. The highest percentage of people (13%) reporting discrimination are among the doctorates and next highest comes in the case of master's degree holders.

It seems those with no American education and having less income and the renters have least experience in social group related discrimination. The higher level of discrimination against the doctorates and master's degree holders seems surprising. It is possible to explain this in another way. Are these people more perceptive in identifying a discrimination experience? Are these people joiners as compared to the others who may be more "self-segregating"[27] and as such do not seek to expand their social activities to non-Indian social groups.

TABLE NO. 16

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION IN JOINING NON-INDIAN SOCIAL GROUP AND SELECTED VARIABLES

	HOMEOWNERS		ANNUAL INCOME							AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND					
EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION	OWNER N=122	RENTER N=48	UNDER $10,000 N=3	10-15 N=13	15-20 N=20	20-25 N=40	25-30 N=31	30-50 N=37	50+ N=32	SOME COLL. N=9	BACHELOR N=9	MASTER N=58	PH.D. N=53	NON DEGREE N=11	NONE N=22
YES	14.8%	0%	0%	7.7%	5%	15%	9.7%	8.1%	12.5%	11.1%	0%	10.3%	13.2%	9.1%	4.5%
NO	59.0%	62.5%	33.3%	46.2%	55%	62.5%	51.6%	67.6%	71.9%	55.6%	77.8%	56.9%	64.2%	72.7%	54.5%
NOT SURE	26.2%	37.5%	66.7%	46.2%	40%	22.5%	38.7%	24.3%	15.6%	33.3%	22.2%	32.8%	22.6%	18.2%	40.9%

VIII

PROTECTED CLASS STATUS AND ATTITUDINAL VARIATIONS AMONG OVERSEAS INDIANS

Given the level of job-related discrimination experienced by Overseas Indians in the United States it seems pertinent to explore their attitudes toward a protected class status. The early East Indians were not classified as Caucasians and their legal struggle to be classified as such has been well documented.[28] In recent years, there has been some attempt to classify the Indians as a minority group. The Association of Indians in America has made a consistent effort to bring about the classification of the Indians as "Asians Indians" beginning 1980 census. This would confer legal minority status upon the Overseas Indians.

The survey questionnaire included an open-ended question about the protected class status of the Indians in the United States. The responses were coded as (1) supportive, (2) supportive with reservations, and (3) unsupportive. The general findings was only 25% of the respondents were supportive of this. Another 9.4% were supportive with reservations. Around 38% clearly opposed such classification and the remaining survey respondents either did not comprehend the question or failed to answer the question.

These variations in the attitudinal orientations of the survey respondents were related to a number of variables. Table No. 17 cross-tabulates the job discrimination related experiences of the survey respondents and their attitudes toward the protected class status. In the category of technical jobs, those who did not experience discrimination only about 16% support the idea of protected class status. This is in some control with the responses of those who experienced discrimination in getting a technical job. Their level of support is much higher (nearly twice: 31%). This pattern is generally consistent with the administrative job experience also.

Table No. 18 provides a cross-tabulation between three major social background variables and the orientations of the respondents toward protected class status. These three major variables are (1) spouse ethnicity, (2) caste identification, and (3) religion identification. Some very interesting patterns seem to emerge from this data.

The respondents with western spouse seem significantly less supportive of protected class status. Whereas a total of about 37% of such respondents are supportive of protected class status with or without reservation of much higher percentage of those with Indian spouse (over 50%) are supportive of the protected class status (with or without reservation).

Caste identification and religion identification variables also indicate a strong relationship. Particularly important is the case of the Caste and Religion resenters. It seems a very high percentage of these groups (44% and 75%) are not supportive of the protected class status for the Indians. On the other hand about a third of the caste and religion identifiers are supportive of such a status. A majority of the religion non-identifier (66%) oppose the idea and also a majority of caste non-identifiers (56%) also oppose the idea. These trends might indicate that these caste and religious identity rejectors may see the protected class status as caste like structure.

TABLE NO. 17

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORIENTATIONS TOWARD PROTECTED CLASS STATUS AND EXPERIENCE WITH JOB DISCRIMINATION
(in percentages)*

ORIENTATIONS TOWARD PROTECTED CLASS STATUS	ALL RESPONDENTS N=212	TECHNICAL JOB DISCRIMINATION			ADMINISTRATIVE JOB DISCRIMINATION		
		EXPERIENCED N=45	DID NOT EXPERIENCE N=102	NOT SURE N=38	EXPERIENCE N=76	DID NOT EXPERIENCE N=65	NOT SURE N=45
SUPPORTIVE	25.9%	31.1%	16.7%	36.8%	28.9%	21.5%	27.9%
SUPPORTIVE WITH RESERVATION	9.4%	13.3%	7.8%	5.3%	10.5%	9.2%	9.3%
UN-SUPPORTIVE	38.2%	28.9%	43.1%	42.1%	36.8%	40.0%	37.2%

* Percentages do not total 100.0% due to the exclusion of non-response categories.

TABLE NO. 18

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORIENTATIONS TOWARD
PROTECTED CLASS STATUS AND SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(in percentages)*

ORIENTATIONS TOWARD PROTECTED CLASS STATUS	SPOUSE ETHNICITY		CASE IDENTIFICATION			RELIGION IDENTIFICATION		
	WESTERN N=29	INDIAN N=53	IDENTIFIER N=132	NON-IDENTIFIER N=39	RESENTER N=9	IDENTIFIER N=143	NON-IDENTIFIER N=30	RESENTER N=8
SUPPORTIVE	27.6%	39.6%	32.6%	15.4%	22.2%	32.2%	13.3%	25%
SUPPORTIVE WITH RESERVATION	10.3%	11.3%	10.6%	12.8%	11.1%	11.2%	13.3%	0%
UN-SUPPORTIVE	6.9%	13.2%	38.6%	56.4%	44.2%	35.7%	66.7%	75%

* Some columns do not total 100.0% due to the exclusion of non-respondents.

Another somewhat intriguing pattern in this respect emerges from Table No. 19 which cross-tabulates the attitudinal orientations and American educational background of the respondents. Nearly 70% of the respondents are opposed to the idea of protected class status! Among the persons with American Education those having doctorate degrees have the highest level of support for protected class status (31%).

Table No. 20 examines the relationship between the caste hierarchy and the orientations of the respondents toward protected class status. One would anticipate that the Brahmin respondents would be less supportive of a protected class status for the Indians in the United States. In fact, this does not turn out to be the case. In comparison with the Non-Brahmin Hindu respondents, the Brahmins seem more supportive of this (31% as against 25%). However, when qualified support and firm support is taken together the level of support among Non-Hindus rises much higher (Brahmin 42% - Non-Brahmins 38%). As to the Non-Hindus and Caste non-identifiers, their level of support for the protected class is slightly higher than the Brahmins and Caste-identifying Non-Brahmins.

Based on this trend in the data one might hazard a suggestion that in general, Caste hierarchy and orientation toward protected class status do not indicate a very significant relationship. Non-Hindus and Caste non-identify group, however, is generally more supportive of this. Given the weakness of caste data in this study it seems more appropriate to pursue the relevance of other independent variables associated with the attitudinal orientation.

TABLE NO. 19

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORIENTATIONS TOWARD PROTECTED CLASS STATUS AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS
(in percentages)*

ORIENTATIONS TOWARD PROTECTED CLASS STATUS	AMERICAN EDUCATION		
	MASTERS N=62	PH.D. N=54	NO AMERICAN EDUCATION N=23
SUPPORTIVE	21.0%	31.5%	21.7%
SUPPORTIVE WITH RESERVATION	9.7%	16.7%	8.7%
UN-SUPPORTIVE	50%	33.3%	69.6%

*Percentages in some columns do not total 100.0% due to the exclusion of non-respondents.

TABLE NO. 20

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CASTE HIERARCHY AND ORIENTATIONS TOWARD PROTECTED CLASS STATUS

ORIENTATIONS	BRAHMINS N=38	NON-BRAHMINS N=108	NON-HINDUS AND CASTE NON-IDENTIFIERS N=33	ALL RESPONDENTS N=179
SUPPORTIVE	31.6%	25.0%	38.7%	25.5%
SUPPORTIVE WITH RE-SERVATION	10.5%	13.0%	6.5%	11.2%
UN-SUPPOR-TIVE	42.1%	40.7%	45.2%	41.9%

*Percentages do not total 100.0% due to the exclusion of non-response and other response categories.

THE "AFFLUENT ETHNICS" AND THE POLICY PRIORITIES IN THE INDIAN SYSTEM

In this section we shall merely focus our attention upon the attitudes of these Overseas Indians toward the public policy priorities in India. The policy priorities of the Indian political system have become particularly interesting to the Overseas Indians since the summer of 1975.[29] A systematic content analysis of the Indian Press in the United States suggests a number of inferences. It appears that Mrs. Gandhi's controversial policies and programs have attracted the attention of the Overseas Indians in the United States. Evaluative judgements about Mrs. Gandhi's regime have appeared in such ethnic press in the form of editorials, feature length articles and in the form of letters to the editor. Some of these writers have blamed Mrs. Gandhi's autocratic rule, which others have praised her policy performance. Mrs. Gandhi's spectacular success in the family planning program has received mixed reception. The Indian ethnic organizations in the United States have taken positions on Mrs. Gandhi's regime. All these developments suggest that the public policy choice of India seems to be a significant political concern of the Indian immigrants in the United States.[30]

The Lok Sabha elections of 1977 and the eventual rise of Janata

Government in New Delhi has further accentuated the debate on public policy priorities. Some Overseas Indians do not see any significant differences between the social policies of Janata Government and that of the erstwhile regime.[31] Others see a major shift in the area of foreign policy and human rights.

However, the Overseas Indians in the United States constitute a widely dispersed people. The activist Indians whose articles, letters and editorials appear in the Indian ethnic press may not be representative of the opinion of the Indian population in the United States. Some Overseas Indians had formed organizations in opposition to the Emergency regime. The leader of such organizations utilized mass media to express their views. They also provided platforms to the political dissidents from India to voice their opinion about the emergency rule of Mrs. Gandhi. The Government of India reacted to such developments by impounding the passports of such India activities.[32] But we know very little about most other Indians and their public policy choices in relations to India.

One way of evaluating the general involvement of our survey respondents may be looked at in Table No. 21. This table suggests a number of indicators. A large majority of the survey respondents (67%) were members of Indian organizations in the United States. A surprisingly high percentage (43%) indicated they had held or were holding some sort of office in such organizations. About 27% of the respondents regularly read the overseas editions of the Indian newspapers. Nearly 40% regularly read the Indian newspapers published in the United States. Those who read these two types of papers constituted around 21% of the entire group. Only a small minority (12%) either did not read such papers or did not care to respond to this item in the survey.

The data on visit to India during the emergency also indicates that nearly half (48%) of the respondents had visited India during this period. The length of such visits varied widely from fourteen days to over a year.

In general, the indicators in Table No. 21 suggest that the survey respondents, in general, were very much involved with the Indian sub-cultures in the United States. Also, their level of interest in the India was probably high as indicated by visitation trends and newspaper readership patterns.

TABLE NO. 21

INVOLVEMENT OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS WITH INDIA AND INDO-AMERICAN SUB-CULTURE

(N=213)
(in percentages)

OFFICE-HOLDING IN INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS	PERCENTAGE
Present/Past Office Holders	43%
Never held such office	42%
Missing Data	15%
	100%

TABLE NO. 21 - Cont'd

MEMBERSHIP IN INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS	PERCENTAGE
Member	67%
Not a Member	26%
Missing Data	7%
	100%

INDIA VISIT DURING THE EMERGENCY	
Visited	48%
Did not Visit	47%
Missing Data	5%
	100%

READERSHIP OF INDIAN NEWSPAPER	
Read Overseas Editions of Indian Newspapers	27%
Read U.S. based Indian Newspapers	40%
Read Both	21%
Missing Data	12%
	100%

FAVORITE INDIAN POLITICAL PARTY	
Congress	27%
Janata	19%
Other Parties	8%
Missing Data	46%
	100%

POLICY PRIORITIES: GENERAL TRENDS

The Table No. 22 provides a distribution of high policy priorities among twenty areas of public policy included in the questionnaire. The list was not designed to be an exhaustive one. It was also not designed to tap the details of public policy preference. The respondents were merely asked what priority should a specific policy area receive--high, medium, or low by the government leaders in India.

As the data in Table No. 3 indicates population control, food production, energy development have high priorities among the survey respondents. Certain tenets of western liberal democracy such as "freedom of press" and "curb police power" have received much lower ranking. Also nuclear energy development. Even mass literacy has received 9th rank in this system.

TABLE NO. 22

PERCEPTIONS OF NATIONAL POLICY PRIORITIES*

(Percentage of Repondents indicating High Priorities)

POLICY AREAS	PERCENTAGES N=213	RANK ORDER
Population Control	87.8%	1
Food Production	86.9%	2
Develop Energy Sources	80.3%	3
Eradicate Political Corruption	77.9%	4
Poverty Eradication	75.1%	5
Control Black Money	66.7%	6
Price Stabilization	63.8%	7
Industrial Growth	55.4%	8
Mass Literacy	55.4%	9
Expansion of Tourist Trade	51.6%	10
Freedom of Press	46.0%	11
Reform Higher Education	44.1%	12
Balanced Regional Growth	32.9%	13
Develop Nuclear Energy	30.5%	14
Urban Renewal	28.6%	15
Improve Condition of SC/ST People	23.5%	16
Curb Police Power	21.1%	17
International Prestige	18.3%	18
Constitutional Change	18.3%	19
Regional Autonomy	12.7%	20

*Based on responses to a closed-ended questionnaire.

In general, it appears that the Overseas Indians have given high priority to bread and butter issues. This trend is particularly significant considering the timing of this survey.

The general trends identified in Table No. 22 may not indicate the policy preferences of the sub-population. In this section, we might consider the relevance of a few selected independent variables. For the purpose of this analysis we have chosen partisanship variable. The survey respondents were asked to indicate their favorite political party in India. As the general profile indicated all respondents did not complete this section. Hence the analysis presented here is limited to the such persons whose favorite party was identified.

The Table No. 23 compares the priority ranking of the Overseas Indians based on their partisan support. With respect to the area of "Freedom of Press"

TABLE NO. 23

PARTISAN SUPPORTERS AND THEIR POLICY ORIENTATIONS IN SELECTED AREAS

POLICY AREA	PRIORITY RANKING	CONGRESS	JANATA	OTHERS	ALL RESPONDENTS*
FREEDOM OF PRESS	High	43%	56%	43%	48%
	Medium	46%	34%	43%	40%
	Low	10%	9%	12%	11%
		N=58	N=41	N=16	N=202
CURB POLICE POWER	High	21%	20%	13%	23%
	Medium	47%	52%	26%	45%
	Low	31%	17%	60%	31%
		N=57	N=40	N=15	N=193
CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE	High	10%	38%	18%	20%
	Medium	42%	33%	12%	34%
	Low	47%	28%	68%	44%
		N=57	N=39	N=16	N=192
POPULATION CONTROL	High	91%	92%	88%	92%
	Medium	7%	7%	5%	5%
	Low	1%	0%	0%	2%
		N=57	N=41	N=17	N=203

*This column also indicates the responses of non-partisans.

there is noticeable difference betweeen the Janata Party supporters and the others. A majority of the Janata Party supporters among the Overseas Indians surveyed (56%) accord high priority to the Freedom of Press. Only about 43% of the Congress Party supporters suggesting high priority are about equal to the other party supporters. During the emergency "Freedom of Press" was a rather controversial policy question. The trends indicated herein suggests significant partisan differences with respect to this policy area.

The Table No. 23 also shows that only a minority of the Overseas Indians suggest high priority for curbing police power in India. The emergency had brought about massive arrest and harrassment of the Indian citizens under MISA. In any case a slighter higher percentage of the Janata Party supporters (30% as against 21%) suggest high priority in this policy area. It is also interesting to note a much lower proporation of other party support (13%) give high priority to this area of public policy.

"Constitutional Change" is a rather broad category. In the context of the 1975-77 situation in India, constitutional questions became highly significant. The Indian and foreign experts produced numerous commentaries on the constitutional changes brought about by Mrs. Gandhi's government.[33] So, it appears constitutional change was a major public issue in India at least at the time of this survey. Only 10% of the Congress supporters among the Overseas Indians give high priority to this area. However, a much higher proporation of the Janata Party supportes 38% give a high priority to constitutional change.

Table No. 23 also indicates a rather surprising consensus among the Overseas Indians with respect to the priority for population control. An overwhelming majority of the Congress Party supporters (91%), Janata Party supporters (92%) and other (18%) give high priority to population control. The survey instrument utilized in this survey did not probe into the administrative details of population policy. It is likely that significant differences may have emerged with respect to such questions among the Overseas Indians.

TABLE NO. 24

PARTISAN SUPPORT AND POLICY ORIENTATIONS
TOWARD SCHEDULED CASTE/TRIBE PEOPLE

PRIORITY RANKING FOR IMPROVING THE CONDITION OF SC/ST PEOPLE	CONGRESS N=47	JANATA N=38	OTHERS N=15	ALL RESPONDENTS N=170*
High	33%	23%	27%	23%
Medium	41%	50%	46%	36%
Low	25%	21%	25%	18%

* In all 20% (N=43) did not answer this question. This column also includes responses of non-partisans.

India's public policy toward its Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes has been subjected to much scholarly analysis.[34] The protective discrimination programs associated with the Scheduled Caste and the Scedhuled Tribe people has raised questions involving "reverse discrimination." The Overseas Indians were asked to indicate their priority ranking the area of Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe people. Table No. 25 provides a comparative analysis of their responses. In general 23% of the survey respondents assigned high priority to the policy area of "Improving the Conditions of SC/ST People." This general trend may be viewed in the light of data provided in Table No. 24. Among the Brahmins the priority ranking

TABLE NO. 25

CASTE ORIGIN AND POLICY ORIENTATIONS
TOWARD SCHEDULED CASTE/TRIBE PEOPLE

PRIORITY RANKING FOR IMPROVING THE CONDITIONS OF SC/ST PEOPLE	BRAHMIN N=39	NON-BRAHMIN N=96	NON-HINDU N=27	ALL RESPONDENTS N=170*
High	25%	26%	50%	23%
Medium	44%	44%	34%	36%
Low	17%	26%	0%	18%
TOTAL	86%	96%	84%	77%

*In all 20% (N=43) did not answer this question. This column also includes the responses of religious non-identified.

is the lowest (25%) and slightly higher in the case of Non-Brahmins (26%). But in the case of Non-Hindus the priority in this area kumps to 50%. This difference seems highly significant., The Non-Hindus may perceive the need for high priority in this case.

The Table No. 26 cross-tabulates the responses in this area in relation to partisan support. In this case, about a third of the Congress supporters assign high priority to this area and about 23% of the Janata supporters do so.

TABLE NO. 26

PARTISAN SUPPORT AND ORIENTATIONS
TOWARD REGIONAL POLICY

POLICY AREA	PRIORITY RANKING	CONGRESS	JANATA	OTHER	ALL RESPONDENTS*
BALANCED REGIONAL GROWTH	High	27.8%	39.1%	33.9%	35%
	Medium	53.7	47.8%	50.0%	49%
	Low	18.5%	13.0%	16.0%	14%
		N=56	N=41	N=16	N=195
REGIONAL AUTOMONY	High	13.8%	10.0%	12.5%	13%
	Medium	34.5%	40.0%	31.3%	35%
	Low	51.7%	50.0%	56.3%	50%
		N=58	N=40	N=16	N=197

*This column includes the responses of non-partisans.

The Table No. 27 provides an analysis of the policy orientations of policy. In this context, it is important to note that "balanced regional growth" and "political autonomy" of the state government have been viewed as two key questions in the Indian Federal system. In general, it appears that only a minority of the survey respondents assign high priority to these two areas of policy. However, there are significant perceptible differences. Balanced regional growth seems to have a somewhat higher priority ranking than regional autonomy. Nevertheless the difference between the partisan supporters is also interesting to observe.

TABLE NO. 27

PRIORITY RANKING IN HIGH CONSENSUS POLICY AREAS

POLICY AREAS	PRIORITY RANKING	CONGRESS	JANATA	OTHERS	ALL RESPONDENTS*
FOOD PRODUCTION	High	94%	92%	87%	92%
	Medium	5%	9%	12%	7%
	Low	0%	0%	0%	0%
		N=57	N=41	N=16	N=200
POVERTY ERADICATION	High	86%	92%	58%	81%
	Medium	12%	5%	43%	15%
	Low	1%	2%	0%	3%
		N=58	N=39	N=16	N=197
POPULATION CONTROL	High	91%	92%	88%	92%
	Medium	7%	7%	5%	5%
	Low	1%	0%	0%	2%
		N=57	N=41	N=17	N=203

*This column also includes the responses of non-partisans.

The Table No. 27 provides a comparative analysis of the priority ranking of the Overseas Indians with respect to what we have viewed as "high consensus" policy areas—Food Production, Poverty Eradication and Population Control. The data in Table No. 26 indicates very little difference among the survey respondents based on their partisan identification.

It is particularly interesting to note that in the area of population control no significant difference exist between the Janata Congress Party supporters.

India's nuclear policy has created world controversy.[35] The western world has questioned its nuclear program. The Table No. 28 provides a comparative view of the Overseas Indians toward India's nuclear policy. In

TABLE NO. 28

PARTISAN SUPPORT AND
NUCLEAR POLICY PRIORITY

PRIORITY RANKING FOR NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES	CONGRESS N=56	JANATA N=40	OTHERS N=16	ALL RESPONDENTS* N=194
High	40%	25%	31%	33%
Medium	32%	45%	50%	34%
Low	28%	30%	18%	32%

* This column also includes the responses of non-partisans.

general only about 28% of the survey respondents assigned high priority to nuclear development.

Partisan differences are significant here. About 40% of the Congress supporters assign high priority to nuclear capability of India. This drops to about 25% in the case of Janata supporters and rises to about 31% in the case of the others. Mrs. Gandhi's regime had openly pursued an aggressive policy involving the nuclear capability of India. The higher level of support for nuclear development among the Congress supporters may be explained in the light of such policy position.

"Price Stabilization" and controlling "Black Money Circulation" are two other key areas of public policy in India. Table No. 29 provides a comparative analysis of these two areas. In general a great majority of the Overseas Indians (over 65%) consider these two as high priority policy areas. The Janata supporters seem more supportive of high priority in the area of Black Money Circulation.[36] This is also the case with Price Stabilization.

X

POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS OF "AFFLUENT ETHNICS": SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this paper has several limitations. The survey did not constitute a representative sample of the Overseas Indian population in the United States. Nevertheless, the social profile of the survey respondents suggests that they closely reflect the characteristics of the construct "Affluent Ethnics" proposed in this study. A number of tentative conclusions seem to emerge from this study about the political orientations

TABLE NO. 29

PARTISAN SUPPORT AND POLICY PRIORITIES
TOWARD BLACK MONEY AND PRICE STABILIZATION
(in percentages)

POLICY AREA	RANKING	CONGRESS	JANATA	OTHERS	ALL RESPONDENTS*
CONTROL BLACK MONEY CIRCULATION	High	70.7%	73.2%	75.0%	70%
	Medium	27.6%	19.5%	18.8%	24%
	Low	1.7%	7.3%	6.3%	5%
		N=58	N=41	N=16	N=202
PRICE STABILIZATION	High	65.5%	70.7%	64.3%	68%
	Medium	32.8%	26.8%	35.7%	29%
	Low	1.0%	1.0%	0%	2%
		N=58	N=41	N=14	N=199

*This column also includes the responsed of non-partisans.

of the "Affluent Ethnics."

Firstly, the study has indicated the feasibility of conducting survey research among a widely scattered American ethnic group. Considering the mail survey the response rate has been unusually high. This could be due to the background attributes of the group surveyed and its elitist orientation. Perhaps the rate of response could have been still higher if the study would have been an anonymous one. A significant proportion of the respondents had erased their identity from the return envelope indicating their desire to be anonymous. It seems plausible to suggest that among those who did not return the questionnaire, these are individuals we would have also preferred an anonymous survey. Some of the first generation immigrants are probably apprehensive to the abuse of survey research. A Yugoslov scholar reports similar problems in a comparable study.[37]

Secondly, these "Affluent Ethnics" seem cognizant and concerned about American public policies. Nearly 70% of the survey respondents indicated partisan support. Only a very small percentage expressed no opinion on questions of public policy indicating that an overwhelming majority of these Indians do have an opinion about most areas of American public policies. The policy priority of this new ethnic group showed some similarities and differences in relation to the American public. Such variances are probably

attributable to their social standing in the community, their immigrant status and their political socialization in the Indian system. There are many unanswered questions about the policy priorities of the Overseas Indians. What sort of Overseas Indians seem to indicate conservative policy orientations? Why are most Indians not so pro-black? Why are these Indians not so concerned about political corruption? Such questions merely suggest an agenda for future exploration.

Thirdly, with respect to the question on policy priorities in the Indian system, these "Affluent Ethnics" do not seem to accord high priority to policy areas relating to "Freedom of Press" and "human rights." These priorities seem to rank far below other concerns like population control, food production, energy respources and poverty eradication. Considering the fact that these matters seemed highly significant during the Indian emergency, their low priorities among the Overseas Indians population is rather intriguing! There seems to be an overwhelming consensus among the Overseas Indian respondents about certain policy areas, e.g., Population Control, Food Production, Energy Development. Political Corruption and Black Money Circulation are also other significant concerns of the respondents. The controversial nuclear energy development policy of the Indian Government seems to have a very low priority. Considering the educational background of the survey respondents it is plausible to suggest that they may perceive some problems. It also appears that the partisan support among the Overseas Indians seems to be associated with their attitudes toward policy priorities in certain areas. But Caste origin is clearly a significant correlate in relation to the policy priorities involving the SC/ST population.

There are tentative conclusions. A comprehensive study of the Overseas Indians in diverse American communities is needed to derive significant inferences about the political orientations of the Overseas Indians. Considering the dispersed nature of the Indian community perhaps collaborative effort of the social scientists of Indian origin may be the answer to this problem.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Some studies of ethnic electoral behavior are as follows: Bret Hawkins, The Ethnic Factor in American Politics (Columbus: Mervile, 1969); Norman Nie, et.al. "Political Attitudes Among American Ethnics," in Andrew Greeley (ed.), Ethnicity in the United States (New York: Wiley, 1974) and Michael Parenti, Ethnic and Political Attitudes (New York: Arno Press, 1975) and Bruce Merrill "Partisanship, Ethnicity and Electoral Change," Public Service September 1976, pp. 1-4.

[2] Such studies about minority political sub-culture include the following: Chris Garcia, Political Socialization of Chicano Children (New York: Praeger, 1973); Dean Jaros, et.al., "The Malevoleni Leader: Political Socialization in an American Subculture," American Political Science Review, 1968, pp. 564-75; Donald Pienkos, "Foreign Affairs Perceptions of Ethnics: The Polish-Americans of Milwaukee," Ethnicity, October 1974, pp. 223-236; Lawrence McCaffrey, "The Conservative Image of Irish-Americans," Ethnicity, September 1975, pp. 271-280.

[3] Some studies of black political sub-culture in the U.S. may be seen in the following: Joel Aberbach and Jack Walker, "The Meaning of Black Power," American Political Science Review, 1970, pp. 367-388; Paul Abramson, "Political Efficacy and Political Trust Among Black School Children," Journal of Politics, 1972, pp. 1243-69.

[4] Some recent studies include the following: Jennifer Iturstfield, "Internal Colonialism: White, Black and Chicano Self-Conceptions," Ethnic and Racial Studies, January 1978, pp. 60-79.

[5] Some non-American studies of minority political sub-culture are as follows: P. Y. Medding, From Assimilation to Group Survival: A Political and Sociological Study of an Australian Jewish Community (New York: Hart, 1969); Donald Tugby, Cultural Change and Identity: Mandailing Immigrants in West Malayasia (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1977); P. R. Wilson, Immigrants and Politics (Camberra: Australian National University Press, 1973).

[6] The example of elite-level minority studies include the following recent works: George Crockett, "Black Judges and Black Judicial Experience," Wayne State Law Review, November, 1972; Michael Smith, "Social Background and Role Perceptions of Black Judges," a paper presented at 1973 Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association and Adam Herbert, "The Minority Administrator," Public Administration Review, December 1974.

[7] Some major book-length works about the Overseas Indians include the following: S. Arasaratnam, Indians in Malayasia (London: 1970);

G. S. Arora, The New Frontiersmen: Indians in Great Britain (Bombay: 1976); Aghedanand Bharati, The Asians in East Africa (Chicago: 1972); N. R. Chakravarty, The Indian Minority in Burma (London: 1971); Ravindra Jain, South Indians on the Plantation Frontiers in Malaya (New Haven: 1970); Richard Lambert, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis: 1956); Yogendra Malik, East Indians in Trinidad (London: 1971); Adrian Mayer, Peasants in the Pacific (Berkely: 1972); Hugh Tinker, The Banyan Tree (London: 1977) and Paul Kratoska, The Chettiar and the Yeoman (Singapore: Institute of South East Asian Studies, 1975).

[8]Gary Hess, "The Forgotten Asian Americans: The East Indian Community in the United States," in Akira Iriye (ed.), The Asian American (Santa Barbara: American Bibliographica Center, 1976), pp. 157-178. Also see Jogesh Misrow, East Indian Immigration on the Pacific Coast, (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1971). Writing reflecting American attitudes toward the early East Indian-immigrants in the United States may be found in the following. This author is thankful to Professor Bruce La Brach for providing the annotations on these rare sources. Agnes F. Buchanan, "The West and the Hindu Invasion," Overland Monthly, November 1907, pp. : Fred Lockley, "The Hindu Invasion," The Pacific Monthly, May 1907, pp. 584-595; Herman Scheffauer, "Tide of Turbans," Forum, June 1910, pp. 616-618; "The Hindu: The Filth of Asia," The White Man, August 1910, pp. ; "Hindus too Brunette to vote here," Literary Digest, March 10, 1923, p. 13.

[9]Hugh Tinker, "Indians Abroad," in Michael Twaddle (ed.), Expulsion of a Minority (London: Athlone Press, 1975), p. 15.

[10]U.S. Department of Commerce, We, the Asian Americans (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1973), p. 3.

[11]These unofficial sources include informal survey of Indian ethnic newspapers in the U.S. and impressionistic data from the officials of Indian organizations.

[12]The plans for the U.S. Census of 1980 provides for the classification of Overseas Indians as "Asian Indians." This decision is partly explained by the intensive lobbying effort of the Association of Indians in American, Inc. See Appendix "C" for AIA achievements.

[13]Some studies on these earlier Indian immigratns to the United States may be seen in Bruce La Brach bibliography, op. cit. (1977).

[14]Colleen Taylor, "Indians in America," The Indic (Chicago), February/March 1977, pp. 16-18.

[15]Annual reports of the immigration service contains occupational background of Indians who acquire U.S. citizenship.

[16]Jogesh Misrow, East Indian Immigrants on the Pacific Coast (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1971).

[17] Mahendra Doshi, Who is Who Among Indians in North America (1975).

[18] A study on the partisan identification in India may be found in Samuel J. Eldersvell, "Party Identification in India," Comparative Political Studies, October 1973, pp. 271-295; and Manindra K. Mohapatra, "Partisan Identification and Orientation Toward Politicians," International Behavioral Scientist (December 1977).

[19] For comparative data on other immigrants see Kristian Hvidt, Flight to America: The Social Background of Danish Immigrants, (New York: Academic Press, 1975); Hyung-Chan Kim, "Some Aspects of Social Demography of Korean Immigrants," International Migration Review, Spring 1974, pp. 23-42; Daphne Phillips, "The Effect of Immigration on the Family," British Journal of Sociology, June 1975, pp. 218-226.

[20] A discussion about the relevance of mass opinion about public policy preferences may be seen in Terry N. Clark, "Citizen Preference and Urban Public Policy," Policy and Politics, June 1976.

[21] Hugh Tinker, The Banyan Tree (London: Oxford University Press, 1977).

[22] A comparative study of the political attitudes of American Ethnic and Non-ethnics was done by Norman Nie, et.al., "Political Attitudes Among American Ethnics," in Andrew M. Greeley (ed.), Ethnicity in the U.S.: A Preliminary Reconnaissance (New York: Wiley, 1976).

[23] William Kuepper, et.al., Ugandan Asians in Great Britain (New York: New Vierpoint, 1975).

[24] For a typological analysis of institutional discrimination see Joe Feagin, "Indirect Institutional Discrimination," American Politics Quarterly, April 1977, pp. 177-200.

[25] The report of a comparable study in Chicago area may be found in Hekmat Elkhanialy and Ralph Nicholas, "Racial and Ethnic Self-Designation, Experience of Discrimination and desire for legal minority status among Indian immigration in the USA," in Elkhanialy and Nicholas (eds.).

[26] This may have something to do with the development of academics. A conceptual view of professional development may be found in the Harold Hodgkinson, "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators," Educational Record, Fall 1974, pp. 263-274. Also see Edward Shils, "The Immigrant Intellectual," in Bhikhu Parekh (ed.), Color, Culture and Consciousness: Immigrant Intellectual in Britain (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974).

[27] A discussion about the "self-segregating" trend among some Overseas Indians may be found in Michael Lyon, "Ethnic Minority Problems: An Overview of Some Recent Research," New Community, Autumn 1973, p. 347.

[28] On this question the following sources provided detailed information: U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Immigration. TO PERMIT THE NATURALIZATION OF APPROXIMATELY THREE THOUSAND NATIVES OF INDIA. Hearing before a sub-committee of the Committee on Immigration, 78th Congress, 2nd Session, in Senate Bile 1595. September 13 and 14, 1944. (Reference cited in Bruce La Brach's Bibliography, op.cit.)

[29] This inference is based on an overview of Overseas Indian Press in the United States. Some of the Indian Newspapers analyzed were as follows: India Abroad (New York), India Times (Chicago), and India Express (Washington, D.C.).

[30] Some examples of these writings are as follows: Ousepj Varkey, "One Vote of Confidence in Indira Gandhi," India Abroad, March 18, 1977, pp. 2-9; Baidya N. Verma, "The Election Holds Out Many Opportunities," India Abroad, February 25, 1977, pp. 2-8; Chandra Mehra, "The Ultimate Winner Will Be Democracy," India Abroad, March 21, 1977, p. 2; Moni Nag, "Sterlization Issue," India Abroad, June 10, 1977, p. 10.

[31] Baidyanath Verma, "A New Agenda for India," The Indic, June/July, 1977, pp. 8-9.

[32] Some of the famous Overseas Indians whose passports were impounded include Shrikumar Poddar, S. R. Hiremath, and Sharan Naudi.

[33] Scholarly evaluation of the emergency rule of Mrs. Gandhi may be seen in the following works: Normal Palmer, "The Crisis of Democracy in India," Orbis, Summer 1975; W. H. Morris-Jones, "Creeping but Uneasy Authoritarianism: India 1975-76," Government and Opposition, Winter L977, pp. 20-41; Rajani Kothari, "Restoring India's Political Process," Virginia Quarterly Review, Winter 1977, pp. 1-16; Marcus Franda, "Slogans of Indian Emergency," American University Field Staff Report, Vol. 20, No. 11, 1977, pp. 1-9.

[34] J. Michael Mahar (ed.), The Untouchables in Contemporary India (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972).

[35] The Overseas Indians press has also provided an opportunity to debate India's nuclear policy. This is indicated by the letter to the editor published in such newspapers.

[36] Janata Government demonetized 1000 rupee notes in December 1977, as a measure to check Black Money Circulation.

[37] Branko M. Colakovic, Yugoslav Migration to America, (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1973), pp. 164-170.

APPENDIX "A"

COPY OF U.S. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT GRANTING MINORITY STATUS TO INDIANS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

August 20, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Ad Hoc Committee on Race/Ethnic Categories

SUBJECT: Race/Ethnic Categories for Civil Rights Compliance Reporting

In April 1975 representatives of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Office for Civil Rights (DHEW), the General Accounting Office, and the Office of Management and Budget met and agreed to test, for at least a year, a set of common categories for civil rights compliance reporting. Subsequently, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (DOL) and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice agreed to accept this agreement. On August 16, 1976 a meeting was held with these same agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to review the categories and make any recommendations for change.

The group reached a consensus on changes in the definition of the categories. The agreed upon categories are as follows. (NOTE: Underscoring indicates new language. Language in brackets has been deleted.)

Data Categories:

1. Black, not of Hispanic Origin. A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

2. Hispanic. A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish Culture or origin, regardless of race.

3. Asian or Pacific Islander. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.

4. American Indian or Alaskan Native. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

5. White, not of Hispanic Origin. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East, [or the Indian Subcontinent].

It was agreed that these categories would be used when reporting was to be carried out by observation only. Further, it was agreed that the changes would be implemented when new forms were submitted for clearance. No changes would be required on existing forms.

If you have any comments they should be in my hands by close of business September 7, 1976. Any significant changes which are suggested will be discussed with you either by telephone or by reconvening the meeting. If no significant changes are suggested, I will distribute a memorandum announcing the new agreement. I hope that we will be able to minimize any changes.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in arriving at this agreement.

George E. Hall
Chief, Social Statistics
Statistical Policy Division

APPENDIX "B"

INDIAN ETHNIC NEWSPAPER'S
REPORT ABOUT THIS RESEARCH

Indians in America: The need for community-oriented research

Recently India Times received in the mail a paper authored by Dr. Manindra Kumar Mohapatra of Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Va. Dr. Mohapatra is associate professor of political science and is involved "in an ongoing research project titled Overseas Indian Research Project."

Indians In US Show Serious Interest In Indian Affairs

An Indian scholar, Dr. Manindra Kumar Mohapatra, has recently completed a study dealing with the attitude of Indians living in the U.S. toward the political climate in India during the Emerg accession to powe Party. Statistics ir overseas Indian show serious in affairs of the mc but that variatic inter-generational according to e background.

sought to obtain certain key background information about the respondents such as social profile both in the U.S. and India, partisan support and other information. It then listed 20

Survey Finds Little Bia

There is little discrimination bas- ed on race and origin against In- dians residing in the United Sta according to the "preliminary" ings of a mail survey r ndra Kumar Mohar mmon University

ne 5.1 to 75.7; entry into social 8.9 to 53.3; obtaining jobs 22 to 47.7; ad- jobs 46 to 30.8; starting professional practice mission to higher 68.2; observing 5 to 51.9 and 2.8. pairs

SURVEY OF INDIANS IN USA

● INDIAN: Rich, Homeowner

A working paper on overseas Indians revealed that a minority of Indians wanted protected class status in the U.S. The data obtained for the working paper also confirms that a minority had experienced discrimination in gaining social groups getting jobs renting, home buying, starting business practices. These findings were highlighted in "Orientation of Overseas Indians Toward Discrimination in American Society: Preliminary Findings From A Survey Research" by Mahindra Kumar Mohapatra.

The author had surveyed a purposive sample of overseas Indians in the U.S. by

supportive of the protected class status. Another 9.4 percent were supportive with reservations. Amount 38 percent clearly opposed such classification.

Few interesting tables highlighting the findings on Indians in the U.S. are shown below.

A GENERAL PROFILE

OCCUPATION	% of RESPONDENTS
Academic	25
Engineer	14
Doctor/Dentist/Vet.	20
Scientific Worker	8
Businessman	6
Teacher	4

APPENDIX "C"

SOME CLAIMED ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF INDIANS IN AMERICA

1967—First Convention of the Indian Immigrants at Princeton, N.J., and founding of A.I.A. August 20.

1970—Adoption of the AIA Constitution - March 7.
—Incorporation of the Association - October 27.

1971—Relief work for the millions of refugees in India during the Bangladesh War of Liberation.

1972—Relief work for the Ugandan Asian Refugees who arrived in the U.S. on a special quota.
—Citation of Appreciation in honor of Congressman Edward I. Koch for his humanitarian work in support of the Bill that authorized the special immigration quota for the Ugandan Asian Refugees - October 21.

1973—IRS Tax Exempt Status granted to AIA - January 23.
—Citation in United States Congressional Record (Vol. 119, No. 30) for the AIA's program in helping the Ugandan Refugees - February 27.
—Opening of the Indian Cultural Center, New York
—The First Honor Banquet - November 3.

1974—Council on Medical Affairs, First Meeting & Symposium, New York - September 28.
—Second Honor Banquet - November 9.
—Committee on Career Advancement.
—Council on Travel & Tourism.

1975—Executive Dinner Meeting with Ambassador and Mrs. R. Jaipal, New York - February 23.
—Project India Inauguration - February 23.
—Revised Constitution adopted - March 23.
—Committee on Critical Issues.
—Advisory Council on India Studies.
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Ambassador T. N. Kaul - April 19.
—Project Bicentennial at Philadelphia - May 11.
—Council on Medical Affairs, Second Annual Meeting and Symposium - May 31.
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Ambassador & Mrs. William B. Saxbe - June 20.
—Cable to India's Prime Minister on the State of Emergency - July 14.
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Honorable Y. B. Chavan - Sept. 26.

1976—Engineering Council, First Meeting & Symposium, New York - January 24.
—Council on Trade & Economic Affairs, First Meeting and Panel Discussion - January 28.
—AIA presentations at Washington meetings on The Minority Status of Asian Indians in the U.S. and The 1980 Census and the Enumeration of Asian Indians.
—Publication of the quarterly, The Journal, in new series - March 15.
—Third Honor Banquet - April 3.
—Project Bicentennial at Philadelphia - The "India Week," - April 24 - May 1. Keynote speech Dr. Phillips Talbot, President, Asia Society of New York.
—Commemorative Ceremony for Dr. Anandibai Joshi - First Indian Medical Graduate from U.S. in 1886 - held at Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia - April 24.
—Reception to the India-United States Joint Subcommission on Education & Culture - May 3.
—First Leadership Workshop at Oswego, New York - July 9 - 11.
—Protesting Impounding of Passports of Indian Nationals by the Government of India - July 23.
—First Round Table Conference of Council on Travel & Tourism, New York - August 11.
—Third Annual Meeting and Colloquium of Council on Medical Affairs, New York - September 18.
—Career Advancement Survey - October 23.
—Second Annual Meeting & Workshop of the Council on Trade & Economic Affairs, New York - December 16.

1977—Trustees Luchcon Meeting - January 12.
—Symposium on the 1980 Census
Chicago - March 5
New York - March 6
Philadelphia - April 30
—The Fourth Honor Banquet - April 9
—Executive Luncheon Meeting with Ambassador Kewal Singh, Philadelphia - April 30.
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Ambassador and Mrs. Robert F. Goheen - May 6
—With J. P. Narayan at Downstate Medical Center Brooklyn, N. Y. - May 18
—Conference on Indian Studies in the United States, Philadelphia - May 26 - 27
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Honorable Shanti Bhushan, Minister for Law, India - June 9
—Tenth Anniversary of AIA, Princeton, N.J. - June 25
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Honorable Mohan Dharia, Minister for Commerce, India - August 25.
—Fourth Annual Meeting and Panel Discussion of the Council on Medical Affairs, New York - September 24
—Executive Dinner Meeting with Honorable Atal B. Vajpayee, Minister for External Affairs, India - September 26
—Amendment of the AIA Constitution - October 6
—Asian Indian Day at Lincoln Center, New York - October 8
—Appeal for Indian Cyclone Relief - November 25

APPENDIX "D"

MAJOR INDIAN NEWSPAPERS IN THE USA

INDIA EXPRESS (Bi-Weekly)
P. O. Box 5993
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
EDITOR: Prakash Kunjeer

INDIA-WEST (Fortnightly)
P. O. Box M-28
Fremont, California 94537
EDITOR: Bina Murarka

INDIA NEWS (Weekly)
Embassy of India
Washington, D. C. 20008
EDITOR:

INDIA ABROAD (Weekly)
331 Park Avenue, South
Fifth Floor
New York, N. Y. 10010
EDITOR: Gopal Raju

INDIA TIMES (Weekly)
30 S. Wabash
Suite 1130
Chicago, Ill. 60603
EDITOR: Rajiv Desai

INDIA TRIBUNE (Semi-Monthly)
6264 N. Bell Avenue
Chicago, Ill. 60645
EDITOR: Prashant Shah